

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CEDRIC BELL,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 20-cv-10193  
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

CORIZON HEALTH INC.,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER (1) DISMISSING CLAIM AGAINST DEFENDANT CORIZON  
HEALTH INC. AND CLOSING CASE, (2) TERMINATING AS MOOT  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL (ECF No. 187), AND (3)  
DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN RESPONSE TO ORDER STAYING  
CASE (ECF No. 196)**

This is a prisoner civil rights action that Plaintiff Cedric Bell filed against several Defendants. The sole remaining Defendant is Corizon Health Inc. Corizon recently underwent bankruptcy proceedings. As a result of those proceedings, Bell's claim against Corizon was resolved, and he will be compensated through the bankruptcy plan. That resolution results in the termination of his sole remaining claim against Corizon. Accordingly, Bell's claim against Corizon is **DISMISSED**, and this action is **CLOSED**.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In light of the termination of this matter, Bell's Motion to Appoint Counsel (ECF No. 187) is **TERMINATED AS MOOT**.

The Court notes that Bell has filed a motion in which he acknowledges that he accepted the bankruptcy plan and can no longer “[pursue] legal action any further against Corizon Health Inc.” (Mot., ECF No. 196, PageID.2002.) However, Bell also appears to claim that his mail has been tampered with and that he has been subject to retaliation by the MDOC for participating in this case. (*See generally id.*) He asks the Court to “protect[]” from the MDOC “any funds received”; that he be allowed to “reorder” personal items that the MDOC “destroyed”; that the Court “provide [Bell] a polygraph examination to corroborate the factual evidence”; and that the Court “instruct prison officials staff/employees at Carson City [Correctional Facility] return personal property . . . and cease the campaign harassment.” (*Id.*, PageID.2002, 2004.)

The Court declines to grant this additional requested relief. As described above, the sole remaining claim in this action has now been resolved, and the MDOC and its employees are no longer parties to this action. (*See Orders*, ECF Nos. 131, 136, 140, 144, 149, 172.) In addition, this additional requested relief is beyond the scope of this action. If Bell wishes to pursue this additional relief, he may do so by filing a new civil action. For these reasons, Bell’s motion (ECF No. 196) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Matthew F. Leitman  
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: May 12, 2025

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on May 12, 2025, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan

Case Manager

(313) 234-5126